

25



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,225	10/25/2001	Jeffrey G. Wiley	10016469-1	8739

7590 02/12/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

EHICHIOYA, FRED I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/033,225

Applicant(s)

WILEY, JEFFREY G.

Examiner

Fred I. Ehichioya

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 27 are pending in this office action.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is hard to distinguish the preamble from the body of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, and 3 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent 6,577,907 issued to Joseph Stanley Czyszczewski et al. (hereinafter "Czyszczewski").

Regarding claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method for providing access from a multifunction device to data operatively associated with a user-specified remote storage device, comprising:

establishing a link between said multifunction device and a user-specified remote storage device having said data operatively associated therewith (see column 2, lines 3 – 6); and

accessing said data operatively associated with said user-specified remote storage device from said multifunction device over said link established therebetween (see column 3, lines 50 - 60).

However, Czyszczewski teaches connectivity between the multifunction device which is analogous to link established therebetween. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teaching of Czyszczewski wherein multifunction device can access remote datastores. The motivation is that the connectivity which is a kiosk-like configuration reduces costs and increase productivity.

Regarding claim 3, Czyszczewski teaches identifying said user-specified remote storage device is based at least in part on a path thereto specified by a user at said multifunction device (see column 6, lines 43 – 49 and column 9, lines 39 – 49).

Regarding claim 4, Czyszczewski teaches identifying said user-specified remote storage device is based at least in part on a user profile (see column 3, lines 50 – 55).

Regarding claim 5, Czyszczewski teaches converting a document to electronic format at said multifunction device (see column 2, lines 65 – 67); and combining said document in electronic format with said accessed data (see column 9, lines 3 – 7).

Regarding claim 6, Czyszczewski teaches combining said accessed data with an electronic document generated at said multifunction device (see column 11, lines 12 – 19); and

sending said combined electronic document and accessed data from said multifunction device to a network destination (see column 3, lines 1 – 7 and column 7, lines 12 – 25).

Regarding claim 7, Czyszczewski teaches accessing said data is from an address book operatively associated with said user-specified remote storage device (see column 12, lines 8 – 14).

Regarding claim 8, Czyszczewski teaches identifying a network destination for an electronic document generated at said multifunction device based on said data accessed from said address book (see column 14, lines 15 – 20).

Regarding claim 9, Czyszczewski teaches editing an entry in said address book operatively associated with said user-specified remote storage device from said multifunction device (see column 6, lines 50 – 67).

Regarding claim 10, Czyszczewski teaches configuring said multifunction device before identifying said user-specified remote storage device (see column 3, lines 56 – 60).

4. Claims 2, and 11 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of U.S. Pub. 2002/0075506 issued to Duncan I. Stevenson et al. (hereinafter "Stevenson").

Regarding claim 2, Czyszczewski teaches the claim subject matter as discussed in claim 1. Czyszczewski does not explicitly teach identifying said user-specified remote storage device.

Stevenson teaches identifying said user-specified remote storage device (see page 1, [0012] – [0013]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Stevenson with the teaching of Czyszczewski wherein stores data to be retrieved. The motivation is that If a person working for a particular company is traveling to various locations within the company, and is away from his own personal computer, that person can go to any printer or digital

copier which is on the corporate network, and, simply by entering his standard network password, remotely access and print out his electronic mail.

Regarding claims 11 and 20, Stevenson teaches displaying at least a portion of said data at said multifunction device (see page 2, [0018]).

Regarding claim 12, Czyszczewski teaches a method for accessing user-requested data from a configured multifunction device, comprising:

identifying a remote storage device having said user-requested data operatively associated therewith (see column 7, lines 33 – 40 and column 9, lines 38 – 49).

Czyszczewski does not explicitly teach retrieving said user-requested data operatively associated with said remote storage device from said configured multifunction device.

Stevenson teaches retrieving said user-requested data operatively associated with said remote storage device from said configured multifunction device (see page 2, [0015 and [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Stevenson with the teaching of Czyszczewski wherein messages are retrieved from remote devices through the network. The motivation is that If a person working for a particular company is traveling to various locations within the company, and is away from his own personal computer, that person can go to any printer or digital copier which is on the corporate network,

and, simply by entering his standard network password, remotely access and print out his electronic mail.

Regarding claim 13, Czyszczewski teaches identifying said remote storage device is based at least in part on a path for said remote storage device specified by a user at said configured multifunction device (see column 7, lines 35 – 40 and column 9, lines 38 – 49).

Regarding claim 14, Czyszczewski teaches identifying said remote storage device is based at least in part on a user profile (see column 3, lines 50 – 55).

Regarding claim 15, Czyszczewski teaches converting a document to electronic format at said configured multifunction device (see column 2, lines 65 – 67); and combining said document in electronic format with said retrieved user-requested data (see column 9, lines 3 – 7).

Regarding claim 16, Czyszczewski teaches combining said retrieved user-requested data with an electronic document generated at said configured multifunction device (see column 11, lines 12 – 19); and

sending said combined electronic document and retrieved user-requested data from said configured multifunction device to a network destination (see column 3, lines 1 – 7 and column 7, lines 12 – 25).

Regarding claim 17, Czyszczewski teaches retrieved said user-requested data is from an address book operatively associated with said remote storage device (see column 12, lines 8 – 14).

Regarding claim 18, Czyszczewski teaches identifying a network destination for an electronic document generated at said configured multifunction device based on said user-requested data retrieved from said address book (see column 14, lines 15 – 20).

Regarding claim 19, Czyszczewski teaches editing an entry in said address book operatively associated with said remote storage device from said multifunction device (see column 6, lines 50 – 67).

Regarding claim 21, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device comprising computer-readable media operatively associated with said multifunction device and having computer-readable program code thereon including program code for identifying data operatively associated with a user-specified remote storage device (see column 9, lines 38 – 49).

Czyszczewski does not explicitly teach program code for accessing said data operatively associated with said user-specified remote storage device from said multifunction device.

Stevenson teaches program code for accessing said data operatively associated with said user-specified remote storage device from said multifunction device (see page 1, [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Stevenson with the teaching of Czyszczewski wherein data are access from remote devices through the network. The motivation is that If a person working for a particular company is traveling to various locations within the company, and is away from his own personal computer, that person can go to any printer or digital copier which is on the corporate network, and, simply by entering his standard network password, remotely access and print out his electronic mail.

Regarding claim 22, Czyszczewski teaches said data is an address book (see column 12, lines 8 – 14).

Regarding claim 23, Czyszczewski teaches program code for retrieving an entry from said address book, said entry identifying a network destination (see column 12, lines 8 – 23);

program code for associating said entry from said address book with an electronic document at said multifunction device (see column 7, lines 14 – 26); and

program code for sending said electronic document to said network destination identified by said entry from said address book (see column 7, lines 16 – 22).

Regarding claim 24, Czyszczewski teaches said data is a document in electronic format (see column 2, lines 65 – 67).

Regarding claim 25, Czyszczewski teaches program code for sending a document in electronic format from said multifunction device to a network destination (see column 3, lines 1 – 7 and column 7, lines 12 – 25).

Regarding claim 26, Czyszczewski teaches program code for combining a document in electronic format with a document image at said multifunction device (see column 9, lines 3 – 7);

program code for sending said combination of said document in electronic format and said document image from said multifunction device to a network destination (see column 5, lines 30 – 40).

Regarding claim 27, Czyszczewski teaches said user-specified remote device is another multifunction device (see column 7, lines 26 – 40).


Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 703-305-8039. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Fred I. Ehichioya
Examiner
Art Unit 2172
February 8, 2004


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER